United States Patent and Trademark Office

אוח

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/085,066	03/01/2002	Pere Relats	08758.0001	9139
75	90 10/21/2003		EXAM	INER
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,			WORRELL JR, LARRY D	
Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P. 1300 I Street, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Washington, DC 20005-3315			3765	19
			DATE MAILED: 10/21/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<i>*</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	10/085,066	RELATS ET AL.
7. 	Examiner	Art Unit
	Danny Worrell	3765
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS API Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	 a timely filed amendment whi 	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
 a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). 	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The danave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortener (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the d statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	ecause:	
(a) 🗌 they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s): <u>112 2nd on claims 21 an</u>	<u>d 32</u> .
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	l be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
 For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w 		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to: 15-17 and 26-28.		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>12-14,18-25 and 29-33</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	proved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·
10. Other:		Mens Well
	/	Danny Worrell Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3765



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argument of nonanaglous art is revelant only to obviousness rejections under 103. Therefor the 102 anticipation rejection of claims 12, 13, 23 and 24 is proper since every limitation is taught by Matsuda. Concerning the 103 rejections, it is the examiners opinion that art is analogous since both are concerned with warp knitted tubes. Further it remains the examiners opinion that it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to knit using a raschel type machine of Matsuda in order to achieve the knitting speeds and techniques of Raschel warp knitting. In response to applicant's argument that applicant discloses a flat warp knitting machine, it is noted that this feature is not recited in the rejected claim(s).